DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 275 CG 016 854

AUTHOR Adams, Carol; Sherer, Mark
TITLE What Else Don't Real Men Do? Sex Role Orientation and Adjustment in College Males.
PUB DATE Mar 83
NOTE 8p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association (29th, Atlanta, GA, March 23-26, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adjustment (to Environment); *Androgyny; *College Students; Higher Education; Individual Power; Interpersonal Competence; *Males; *Personality Traits; Psychological Characteristics; Self Concept; *Sex Role; Social Adjustment

ABSTRACT

Bem's androgyny theory predicts better psychological adjustment in androgynous males and females (those with a balance of masculine and feminine traits) than in traditionally masculine men or feminine women. However, recent research suggests that androgynous individuals have no advantage over masculine-typed individuals of either sex. To explore the relationship between adjustment and sex-role orientation in college males, 45 male students completed the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI). A median split procedure was used to form four sex-role groups: androgynous, masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated males. These four groups were compared on the 3 validity and 10 clinical scales of the MMPI. Data analyses showed that masculine men had greater ego strength and were less socially introverted than feminine men. No significant differences were found between masculine and androgynous men. There was also a significant negative correlation between masculine scores and the Si scale of the MMPI, and a significant positive correlation between femininity and the Si scale. The results tend to support the hypothesis that "real men" (masculine men) are similar to androgynous typed men in that they tend to have greater ego strength and less social discomfort than feminine or undifferentiated men. Additional support was generated for the notion that masculinity is the important trait in the adjustment of androgynous men. (WAS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED233275

WHAT ELSE DON'T REAL MEN DO?:
SEX ROLE ORIENTATION AND ADJUSTMENT IN COLLEGE MALES

Carol Adams
Indian Rivers Community Mental
Health Center
Tuscaloosa, AL

Mark Sherer
Mississippi State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mark Sherer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 016854

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA, March 23-26, 1983.

What Else Don't Real Men Do?: Sex Role Orientation and Adjustment in College Males

Carol Adams
Indian Rivers Community
Mental Health Center
P. O. Box 2190
Tuscaloosa, AL 35403

Mark Sherer
Mississippi State University
P. O. Drawer NL
Mississipi State, MS 39762

Bem's (1974) androgyny theory predicts better psychological adjustment in androgynous males and females--those with a balance of masculine and feminine traits--than in traditionally masculine men ("real men") or feminine women. A growing body of research suggests, however, that androgynous persons enjoy no advantage over masculine-typed persons of either sex. Kelly and Worrell (1977) concluded in a review of the literature that androgynous and masculine persons tend to share similar characteristics indicative of better psychological adjustment while feminine and undifferentiated persons (those with low levels of masculine and feminine sex-role traits) tend to share similar characteristics of poorer adjustment. In a test of Kelly and Worrell's hypothesis with college women using the MMPI to measure adjustment and the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) to measure sex role orientation, Adams and Sherer (1982) found that androgynous and masculine college women did not differ in adjustment and that both groups were better adjusted (i.e., less depressed, anxious, tense, and socially introverted) than undifferentiated women.

There is some evidence to suggest that psychological androgyny may have differential consequences for men and women. Jones, Chernovetz, and Hansson (1978) found that androgynous males scored in the less adaptive direction on a variety of personality, adjustment and intellectual variables. They hypothesized that society tends to view negatively the manifestation of feminine traits in males.

In addition to the question of gender differences in the desirability of psychological androgyny, the issue has been raised as to the "active ingredient" in androgyny. Several investigators have suggested that masculinity is the trait that affords androgynous persons their favorable adjustment (e.g., Antill & Cunningham, 1979; Kelly & Worrell, 1977). They point out that masculinity scores have been found to correlate positively with measures of self-esteem while femininity scores have not. Similarly, Adams and Sherer (1982) found a significant relationship between masculinity, but not femininity, and the relative absence of depression and social introversion in college women. The present investigation attempts to explore the relationship between adjustment and sex-role orientation in college males.

Method

Forty-five college males were administered the MMPI and BSRI. A median-split procedure was used to form four sex-role groups: androgynous, masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated

males. These four groups were compared on the 3 validity and 10 clinical scales of the MMPI using a discriminant analysis.

Results

Although the overall *F* test was not significant, univariate *F* tests were performed. Significant differences were found on the K and Si scales, $F(3,41) = 3.15$, $p < .03$ and $F(3,41) = 3.48$, $p < .02$, respectively. (See Table 1.) Newman-Keul's *t* tests revealed that masculine men had greater ego strength than feminine men, $p < .05$, and were less socially introverted, $p < .05$. No significant differences were found between masculine and androgynous men.

To assess the relative contributions of masculinity and femininity to psychological adjustment, regression analyses were performed using predictor variables chosen post hoc: Those MMPI scales were selected which significantly separated the four groups and at the same time were fairly linear in interpretation. Only the Si scale met both criteria. There was a significant negative correlation between masculinity scores and the Si scale, $r = -.45$, $p < .01$, and a significant positive correlation between femininity and the Si scale, $r = .29$, $p < .05$.

Conclusions

Results tend to support the idea that "real men" are similar to androgynous men in that they tend to have greater ego strength and less social discomfort than feminine or undifferentiated men. Thus, both Bem's theory that androgynous men are better adjusted and Jones, et al.'s (1978) idea that androgynous men are less

well adjusted than "real men" failed to receive support. Additional support was generated for the notion that masculinity is the important trait in the adjustment of androgynous men.

To answer the rather facitious question raised in the title, real men not only don't eat quiche, they also don't feel bad about themselves and they don't sit at home. But then, neither do androgynous men.

Table 1

Mean MMPI Scores for Masculine, Androgynous, Feminine, and Androgynous College Males

	Masculine	Androgynous	Feminine	Undifferentiated
L	46.0	45.8	46.2	46.1
F	61.0	59.7	57.4	56.3
K	55.8	49.2	48.1	52.0
1	54.6	51.2	55.1	56.9
2	47.1	53.2	53.3	56.3
3	58.9	55.7	55.2	58.2
4	64.7	57.7	54.5	59.5
5	56.3	62.3	57.6	59.6
6	57.2	58.4	56.8	57.0
7	57.0	57.7	64.3	63.3
8	60.6	62.1	62.7	65.1
9	72.0	64.3	65.1	63.3
0	43.9	48.9	53.0	49.8

References

Adams, C. H., & Sherer, M. Sex-Role orientation and psychological adjustment: Comparison of MMPI profiles among college women and housewives. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1982, 46, 607-613.

Antill, J. K., & Cunningham, J. D. Self-esteem as a function of masculinity in both sexes. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1979, 47, 783-785.

Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Jones, W. H. Chernovetz, M. D. O'C., & Hansson, R. O. The enigma of androgyny: Differential implications for males and females? Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 1168-1169.

Kelly, J. A., & Worrell, J. New formulations of sex roles and androgyny: A critical review. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 1101-1115.